

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/715,402	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie A. Nicholson III	3651	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Leslie A. Nicholson III. (3) _____.

(2) Lisa Kilday. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 March 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 26, 28 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hsu USPub 2004/0099090.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



GENE O. CRAWFORD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Of the Final Action issued 2/28/2006, the examiner and applicant discussed and agreed upon the following:

The examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the application due to the examiner previously writing a Final Action though independent claim 29 was not amended over the prior art used in the first non-final rejection.

The applicant questioned rejections of dependent claims 26 and 28.

Regarding claim 26 (paragraph 6 of the Final Action), the examiner admitted to a clerical error in the preamble in that the teaching reference of Ishii USP 4936695 was not included. The preamble should read:

"Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai JP 62016939 in view of Ishii USP 4936695 further in view of Hoshino USP 4700437."

Regarding claim 28 (paragraph 7 of the Final Action), the examiner admitted to a clerical error in the preamble in that the name Hoshino was mistakenly typed in, rather than Borisoff. The preamble should read:

"Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai JP 62016939 in view of Ishii USP 4936695 further in view of Borisoff USP 4643069."